

# Imprimatur,

Aug. 19th.  
1987.

*Guil. Needham.*

E - PV  
57506 - 25

REPRODUCED FROM THE COPY IN THE

**HENRY E. HUNTINGTON LIBRARY**

FOR REFERENCE ONLY. NOT FOR REPRODUCTION

# Imprimatur,

Aug. 19th.  
1987.

*Guil. Needham.*

E - PV  
57506 - 25

REPRODUCED FROM THE COPY IN THE

**HENRY E. HUNTINGTON LIBRARY**

FOR REFERENCE ONLY. NOT FOR REPRODUCTION

A  
REQUEST  
TO  
Roman Catholicks  
To Answer the Queries upon these their  
following Tenets.

- § I. *Their Divine Service in an Unknown Tongue.*
- II. *Their taking away the Cup from the People.*
- III. *Their withholding the Scriptures from the Laicks.*
- IV. *The Adoration of Images.*
- V. *The Invocation of Saints and Angels.*
- VI. *The Doctrine of Merit.*
- VII. *Purgatory.*
- VIII. *Their Seven Sacraments.*
- IX. *Their Priests Intention in Baptism.*
- X. *The Limbo of unbaptized Infants.*
- XI. *Transubstantiation.*
- XII. *The Propitiatory Sacrifice of the Mass.*
- XIII. *Private Masses.*
- XIV. *The Sacrament of Penance.*
- XV. *The Sacrament of Marriage, with the Clergies Restraint therefrom.*
- XVI. *Their Sacrament of extream Unction.*
- XVII. *Tradition.*
- XVIII. *That thredbare Question, Where was your Church before Luther?*
- XIX. *The Infallibility of the Pope with his Councils.*
- XX. *The Pope's Supremacy.*
- XXI. *The Pope's Deposing Power.*
- XXII. *Their Uncharitableness to all other Christians.*

---

By a Moderate Son of the Church of *England*.

---

*L O N D O N :*

Printed for *Brab. Aylmer*, at the *Three Pigeons* over against the  
*Royal Exchange* in *Cornhill*, MDCLXXXVII.

А

т а н и ц о в с я

о т

Р а з в и т и я

о т

## A

# REQUEST

TO

## Roman Catholicks, &c.

## SECTION I.

*Their Divine Service in an Unknown Tongue.*

*Quest. 1.* **M**A Y not the Seventh Commandment be as easily reconciled to Adultery, as the Service of the *Roman* Church in an unknown Tongue to 1 *Cor. 14.* where the Apostle Five several Times expressly prohibits it, and gives so many pregnant Reasons for the Inhibition?

2. If the various Gestures and Ceremonies practised by the Priest at Mass be sufficient to excite Devotion in the Spectators, may not a dumb Priest be as useful for that effect; especially he who babbles with a Stentorian Voice, as he who speaks in an unknown Language; since one who cannot speak at all, may be as mimical as he who can speak more Languages than ever *Joseph Scaliger* did, or as many as were at the Confusion of *Babel*?

3. Since it's possible that the Priest may be so Diabolical as to be practising Conjuration in an unknown Language instead of Devotion, or may be cursing his Congregation in lieu of blessing them; would not Reason, without the Apostolick Authority, perswade us of the necessity of understanding his Language, that we may say *Amen* to what he says?

4. Since the Priest in these publick Offices is the Mouth of the People in offering up their Tribute of Honour and Adoration to God; if the

the Congregation understand him not, how can he more justify himself, than if he did celebrate the Service in a Tongue himself knows nothing of, and which neither the one nor the other did understand ?

5. Since it's given as the principal Reason of the *Roman Service* in Latin (by the *Rhemish Annot.*) that Christians where-ever they travel may find the same Service and Priests officiating in it, as at home ; it may be demanded, if for the sake of some few that travel, the many that stay at home should be left destitute ; and for one Man's Convenience, a Thousand be exposed to eternal Perdition ; for there will not be one to a Thousand who understand Latin in the Christian World ?

6. Since in the Service in an unknown Tongue the People are wholly left to the Ability and Sincerity of their Priest, Is not the case of that People very lamentable ? For if the Priest wants the former, he may through Ignorance turn the most Solemn Part of their Service into Ridicule and Nonsense, or Blasphemy : And if he want the later, he may use a Spell for Prayer, or the antient Charm of the *Valentinians Abracadabra*, for *Ave Maria* ; nay, instead of Baptizing in the Name of the Father, &c. he may do by the Person, as a *Jew*, under the Profession of a Priest, is said to have done by a certain Man, in this last Age, who Baptized him in the horrid Name of the Devil ; there being nothing so absurd or wicked, which according to this case, may not be practised.

7. Since Scripture, the Reason of the Thing, the Fathers and Practice of the Church for about Seven Hundred Years together, are for the Expediency and Necessity of having God's Publick Service in a Tongue understood by the People, may it not justly be enquired with what Effrontory the Council of *Trent* hath Anathematized all those who believe the necessity of having God's Solemn Worship in a known Tongue ; as if *Trent*, (because a City of the *Alps*) were transformed into *Mount Ebal*, whence they might curse that great Doctor of the Gentiles in the first place ?

8. Is it not evident from *1 Cor. 14.* that in St. *Paul's* Judgment they deserve to be reckoned Mad-men, who Pray to God in an Unknown Tongue ?

9. Is it not probable that the Romanists have borrowed their Service in an Unknown Tongue, from some Heathens ? who (as *Clemens Alexandrinus* reports) thought those Prayers most effectual, which were uttered in a Barbarous Language ; or from their Neighbours, the old *Cusleans* (of whom *Varro* testifies) that their Priests did scarcely understand their own Sacred Rites.

10. Since the *English* Liturgy is so agreeable to the undoubted parts of the most antient Liturgies, (it being a Form which hath all those parcels of the Roman Offices that were known and used in the first Three Centuries, but wants all the Innovations and Corruptions of the present Mass) May we not truly and pertinently challenge all Christendom to produce any publick Platform (or Solemn Church-Service) so constant to the purest Primitive Devotions ?

11. Since the Famous Bishop of *Condam* hath most cunningly endeavoured a palliative Cure (by soft and smooth Words) as to many Practices in the *Roman Church*, which stand in need of Amputation, yet both in his Exposition and Exhortation, he still passeth by their Service in an Unknown Tongue ; Is it not, because he had no Tongue of his own, to answer for that Practice, which is so directly repugnant to Scripture and Antiquity, having despaired (it seems) to find either Butter or Oyl to cicatrize or soften that Wound ?

---

## S E C T. II.

### *Their taking away the Cup from the People.*

Quest. 1. Since the Council of *Constance*, Anno 1418. made it an Article of Faith, That the Laity ought to receive the Eucharist only in One Kind (*non obstante* of the Institution of Christ, as it was then acknowledged, and the constant Practice of the Catholick Church above a Thousand Years) Wherefore may they not Christen the Laick's Children only in the Name of the Holy Ghost, leaving out the Father and the Son by the way of Concomitancy, it being as lawful to Baptize as to Communicate by halves, and no less certain, that since the Three Persons of the Blessed Trinity partake of the same individual Nature, where one is, all the rest must be ; suppose the Mutilation of the Eucharist could not be disparaged by that Emblem of the Effusion of Christ's Blood, which is necessarily required in the Sacrament ?

2. Since the principal Reason assigned by *Gerson* (for that Canon of the Council of *Constance*, which abstracts the Cup from the People) is the Danger of spilling of the Blood of Christ ; may it not pertinently be demanded, Wherefore may not Laicks in this Age have as steddy hands as the Ages foregoing that Council ? Or if Priests are the best Supporters of a Chalice, Why may they not hold the Cup to Peoples Heads, as well as put the Bread into their Mouths ? (Not to speak

Speak of that Infallible Prescience Christ behoved to have of that imaginary Inconvenience, if we believe him to be God as well as Man.)

3. Since it is also one of the Reasons assigned by *Gerson*, wherefore the Council of *Constance* prohibited the Cup to the People, lest the Consecrated Wine long kept should be converted into Vineger: How can that Fear consist with Transubstantiation, for it is not Blood but Wine which turns into Vineger ?

4. With what Effrontory can any Romanist pretend, that the words of *St. John*, *chap. 6.* are to be understood of the Eucharist, since the Mutilation of that Sacrament is thereby expressly condemned; for a Man cannot be said to drink when he eats ?

5. Since the Eucharist is an Emblem of the Effusion of Christ's Blood; How can they be said to drink of that Cup which is the New Testament of Christ's Blood shed for us, who do not drink at all? Suppose there was Truth in Transubstantiation, and in that of Concomitancy first divised by *Th. Aquinas*.

6. Since the natural Abstemiousness of some Men is likewise assigned as a Reason of that Sacrilegious Mutilation, may it not pertinently be demanded, Why is not the Bread taken away also, because some Persons have been found, who could never taste of any kind of Bread?

7. It it may be farther enquired, if it were a civil Apology at an ordinary Feast (when there are very many invited) that the Host should say, He had provided neither Bread nor Wine, in regard one of the Guests cannot taste of the former, and another cannot drink of the latter ?

8. Since it's impossible to produce one Instance (from any Authentick Record) for a Thousand Years after Christ and more, of the Celebration of the Eucharist in the Face of any particular Church, without giving the Consecrated Cup to all the Communicants, doth it not evidently follow, that the Catholick Church behoved to have been in an Error so long, or that the present Roman Church hath degenerated from the Doctrine and Practice of the Catholick Church for so many Ages ?

---

### S E C T. III.

#### *Their with-holding the Scriptures from the Laicks.*

*Quist. 1.* Since there is no Christian Church (unless it be a Society of Blasphemers under the Notion of a Church) that pretends to

to more Infallibility than Christ and his Apostles, Upon what account should the *Roman Church* require more implicit Faith from its Members, than Christ and his Apostles did from their Hearers? For notwithstanding these were unquestionably endued with an infallible Spirit, and the Gift of Miracles, yet they still remitted their Hearers to the search of the Old Testament, that they might find by their own Reason and Industry, the Doctrine of the Gospel, consonant to the Prophetick Oracles and Mysterious Types of our Saviour's Incarnation and Passion, and were commended for doing so.

2. If the Scriptures are so unintelligible, that an honest man cannot find out the meaning of them, without the Infallible Interpretation of the Church, even in those things which are indispensably necessary to our Salvation, (for we are still ready to say with one of the Ancient Fathers, That as they have Flats wherein a Lamb may wade, so they have Depths wherein an Elephant may swim) I would desire to know, whether Christ and his Apostles preached intelligibly to their Hearers? If not, to what purpose did they preach at all? By what means were Men converted to the Faith? If they did, How came these Sermons to be so unintelligible now they are written, which were so intelligible when they were spoken? For the Gospels contain a plain History of what Christ did and said; and the Apostles wrote the same things to the Churches when they were absent, which they preached to them when they were present; and we reasonably suppose, that they designed that the Churches should as much understand what they wrote, as what they preached; and therefore that they generally used the same Form of Words in their Writings, and in their Preachings; and this makes it a great Riddle, How one should be very plain and easie to be understood, and the other signifie nothing without an Infallible Interpreter.

3. Where the *Turkish Alcoran* is permitted in *English*, viz. at *Rome*, (*Vid. Indic. Libr. prohibit. Alexandr. 7.*) and the Bible in *English* ordain-ed to be burnt, (*vid. ibid.*) Whether do they fancy the Gospel or Alcoran better?

4. Why may not an implicit Faith in the Scripture save a Soul, as well as in the Church; and why may not the one free from Heresie, as well as the other?

5. Since our Saviour recommended the reading of the Scriptures to Laicks, and the Apostle St. *Paul* commended them for doing so, and that the Primitive Fathers pressed it as a Duty on all Ranks of Persons; Must not the Reasons of the Roman Church (in prohibiting the Laicks to read the Word of God, or to have the Bible translated into their Mother Tongue) be exceedingly weighty, if they can preponderate all these Authorities?

6. Since it is well known from Ecclesiastical and Secular History, that the greatest Heresies and Schisms in the Christian Church, and which gave it the greatest and most lasting Trouble, had their Rise from Men in Holy Orders. (who were accounted great Clerks in their time) such as *Marcion*, *Paulus Samosatenus*, *Arius*, *Eunomius*, *Apollinaris*, *Macedonius*, *Photinus*, *Nestorius*, *Eutiches*, *Pelagius*, and many others; *Novatius* also and *Donatius*, who rent the Catholick Church by long lasting Schisms, were Men in Holy Orders; not to speak of *Lucifer* and *Melitius*: Is it therefore a solid Reason to with-hold the Scripture from the ignorant Laicks for fear of their broaching Heresies or Schisms, seeing the sad Experience of the World doth rather teach, that the learned Clergy should be restrained therefrom?

---

## S E C T. IV.

### *The Adoration of Images.*

*Qu. 1.* **D**oth not the Roman Church in picturing of God not only act directly contrary to Sacred Scripture (where it is so frequently forbidden) but also to the very Nature of God, who is an infinite Spirit, and can no more be represented by a bodily Shape, than a Thought can? And how can their Practice be reconciled to that Canon of their Second Council of *Nice*, which determined it not only unlawful, but also absurd and impossible to make an Image of that Being which is spiritual, invisible, and incomprehensible?

2. If any Man can reconcile the Worship of Images to the Second Commandment, may it not also be imagined that he can make Adultery, Perjury, Murther, Theft, and False-witnessing to become Virtues?

3. How can any Man that hath the use of Reason imaging, that the Antients were clear for the Worship of Images, since it is most apparent from the Writings of the most Primitive Fathers, that they all condemned the making of any kind of Image (as unlawful) much more the placing of them in Churches, and most of all the adoring of them?

4. Since in the *Jerusalem Talmud* there is no mention of the Idolatry of Christians (tho frequently of that of the Heathen) because it was written about Two Hundred Years after Christ: But in the *Babylonish Talmud*, which was compiled about Five Hundred Years after Christ's Nativity, there is scarce a Page therein, wherein they do not inveigh against the Idolatry of Christians, and terms their Churches *Beth-havora-zada*, the Houses of Idolatry: May we not (in consideration of the infinite Malice of the Jews against the Christian

stian Religion) most rationally conclude (tho it be from a Negative Argument) that the placing of Images in Churches began not anywhere during the Two First Centuries, and (if we believe both Secular and Ecclesiastical History) not till about the End of the Fifth Century (tho they were worshiped nowhere by publick Authority till after the Days of *Gregory the Great*) not to speak of that Canon of the Council of *Elliberis*, and that Epistle of *Epiphanius* (translated by St. *Hierom*) which positively holds forth, that in the Fourth Century it was judged simply unlawful to have any Image in a Church, whether painted or graven.

5. May not Garlick and Onyons (the *Egyptian* Deities) be justly accounted Gods right worshipful, when compared with the Nails, the Thorns, the Chips, and Shreds, and many other Objects of the Roman Adoration?

6. Since the Governing Part of the Roman Church teacheth and enjoyneth the People to worship Images with an inferiour kind of Adoration (as the Council of *Trent* phraseth it) is it not (in some sense) charitably done by them, not to let them know the Second Commandment (by expunging it out of their Chatechisms) that the People may not become guilty of sinning against so plain a Law?

7. Since the Romish School-men have devised many Distinctions of Religious Worship, (no where to be found in Sacred Scripture) to obviate the Imputation of Idolatry to the Adorers of Images, Saints and Angels, &c. (such as *Latria*, *Dul'ia*, *Hyperdulia*; a Relative and Terminative Worship; a Mediate and Immediate; a Direct and Indirect; a Supreme and Subordinate; a Sovereign and Subaltern; a Transitive and Final; a Proper and Analogical, &c.) May it not justly be demanded, if any sober Person can rationally imagine, that ignorant Laicks are sufficiently warned by these Beacons to shun the Rocks of Idolatry, when their greatest Clerks controvert among themselves about the proper import of those Terms, and the due Application of them, as is most evident from the contrary Sentiments of *Aquinas* and *Bellarmino*, *Vasquez* and *Perron* concerning them?

8. Since Miracles are especially necessary to convince Unbelievers, and that many Miracles were Recorded before the Reformation, but few or none after it; Is it not an Argument sufficient to make a wary Man believe that there were few real Miracles at any time, since the settlement of Christianity? And that only the Superstitions Credulity of former Ages was apt to be abused with such Pretences? (well-meaning Ignorance being easily wheedled thereby into a Golden Dream of great Advantages redounding from the Adoration of Images, &c.) in regard that there is far more need of them since the Reformation (when so

many disbelieve the Roman Religion) than was before, when all the Nations of the West appeared to be at the Devotion thereof.

---

## S E C T. V.

### *The Invocation of Saints and Angels.*

*Qu. 1.* When Romanists pray to Saints departed to pray for them, it may be pertinently inquired, that these Saints do either hear their Prayers, and become acquainted with their Desires, or they do not? If they do hear all those Prayers that are put up to them at the same time by innumerable persons through all the World, what's this but to ascribe to them that Omnipresence and Omniscience which is peculiar to God alone; especially if it be considered, that their Devotions are not only Verbal, but also Mental, (*Voce vel mente supplicare*, being decreed by the Council of *Trent*) yea, it is necessarily implied in every Prayer that is made to them, that they not only hear it, but also know the disposition of the heart, from whence it proceeds; otherwise the Hypocritical Supplicant must be supposed as likely to obtain their favours as the sincerest Votary: if they do not hear their Prayers, then its very absurd and ridiculous, (and a great abuse of that reason God hath given Men for other ends than to trifle with) to pray to them: As for that imaginary Glass of the Trinity, it may be further demanded, if the glorified see all things therein, or but some? if all, then they must share in God's incommunicable Property, which is to be the searcher of the Heart; if but some, what assurance have we that they see those things whereof we stand most in need? so that we cannot pray in Faith.

2. Since the learned Men of the *Roman Church* (such as *Bellarmin*, *Valentia*, *Horstius*, and many others) conclude their Books with Praise to God, the blessed Virgin, and Jesus Christ; may it not be pertinently demanded, if they give her not only an equal part with God in their Praises, but by placing her before Christ, seem to give somewhat of preeminence above him?

3. Since its acknowledged by the most part of the Popish Schoolmen, that the Invocation of Saints and Angels was not enjoyed in the Old Testament, because of the Limbo wherein these Fathers were before Christ's Resurrection; so that not being admitted to the Beatific Vision, they could not hear those Prayers upon Earth: It may be pertinently demanded, 1. What should have restrained the Worship of the Angels at that time, who since their Creation enjoyed that blessed Vision;

Vision ; they being represented in the Old Testament as the constant Attendants and Retinue of God, and the great Ministers of his Providence, and therefore they were as capable of Divine Worship in the time of the Law as they are now, and it may be, a little more ; for the Law it self was given by the Ministry of Angels, and their Appearances were more frequent and familiar ; and the World seemed to be more under the government of Angels then, than it is now, since Christ is made the Head of the Church, and exalted above all Principalities and Powers ? 2. What Evasion can they find, who are of Opinion, that the glorified Saints at all times did know the Petitions put up to them from Earth, not by the Beatifical Vision, but by special Divine Revelation ? 3. Since the generality of the Fathers of the three first Centuries were of Opinion, that the glorified Saints shall not enjoy the Beatifical Vision till the day of Judgment, it may be pertinently enquired, if these Fathers practised or believed the necessity, or expediency of Saint-Invocation ; no fewer than Eighteen of the Fathers, being of this Opinion, by the Romanists own confession ?

4. What is more in the *Apostrophe of Greg. Nazian.* to his Sister *Gorgonia*, or S. *Jerom* to his devout *Paula*, and S. *Augustin* to his Mother *Monica* ; than in these *Apostrophes* frequently found in Sacred Writings to infestate Creatures ; *Hear O ye Mountains the Lord's Controversie : Praise the Lord ye Dragons, and all Depps, &c.* And who will infer from hence, that the infestate Creatures were hereby invok'd and addressed unto ; yet we must carefully distinguish betwixt the Speeches of some particular Fathers, and the general Doctrine of the Church, betwixt what they express in Rhetorical Strains to move Affection, and what they lay down in plain terms to inform the Judgment : betwixt what results from the heat of their popular Orations, and what in cool and deliberate Debates they set down for the Truth of Christ ; for its generally confess'd, that the Fathers oft-times hyperbolize, particularly St. *Chrysostom* ; and we must not take their flights of Fancy for the Doctrine of the Church.

5. If these words *Marth. 4.10.* taken out of *Deut. 6. 13.*, *Him only shall thou serve* ; are to be understood only of the highest degree of Religious Worship as a part of the whole, and distinguish'd from a lower kind ; this superior degree being *Latria*, and the inferiour degrees *Hyperdulia*, and *Dulia* (as the Romanists term them) it may be demanded, how could that have been a sufficient Answer to the Devils demand ? for he might thus have replied to the Son of God, I acknowledge the Sovereign and Almighty Power of God as well as you (the same acknowledgment being insinuated by himself, St. *Luke chap. 4. 6.*) therefore I desire not thou shouldest Worship me as God with *Latria*, but

but only with *Dulia*, a lower kind; thy Heart, the most elevated conceptions of thy mind may be reserved to God, its only the outward act I challenge of thee, that thou wouldst only fall down and Worship me, or by falling down, Worship me; which our Saviour simply refused notwithstanding.

6. Since the chief argument whereby the Primitive Fathers used to prove the Divinity of the Holy Ghost, and of the Son, against the *Macedonians* and *Arians*; was the Catholick practice of the Church in praying to them: what force could have been in that argument, had they believed that any Creatures (tho never so highly exalted in Nature and Condition) might have had that Honour payed unto them?

7. Since the Catholicks did frequently accuse the *Arians* of Idolatry, for praying unto Christ (whom they conceived to be no more than an excellent and good-like Creature) had the Catholicks at the same time practised the Invocation of Saints, might not the *Arians* have returned the Charge with greater force upon themselves; for if the Catholicks had replied as the Romanists do now, that though they did pray to the blessed Spirits, yet they did it not with that Sovereign, Direct, and final Prayer, nor with those sublimest thoughts and intentions of Honour wherewith they did address to God, but only with indirect, subaltern, and relative Prayer, and with no higher Intentions of Honour to them, than what is proportioned to the excellencies of their finite Nature: Since the *Arians* might have returned upon them with great advantage, by saying, *Sirs, With the same due Limitations we Invocate the Man Jesus Christ, who (as the Scripture assures us) is exalted above all Angels, Principalities and Powers, and every Name which is named in Heaven and Earth; so that tho we may not Honour the Son in the same high degree as we do the Father, yet the Scripture enjoyns us to do it with that same kind of Honour:* Which is more than can be said in defence of that Honour and Invocation you offer to Saints and Angels.

8. Since the fancy of making the Court of Heaven resemble Princes Courts on Earth, hath brought forth that voluntary Humility of Worshiping Saints and Angels, at least this excuse of the *Romish* Supplicants, that its out of an humble sense of their own unworthiness, and an awful regard to the infinite Majesty of God, that they address not immediately to himself, but by the Mediation of Saints and Angels these Courtiers and Favourites of Heaven; may it not be pertinently demanded, What wise Man on Earth, who is abundantly satisfied of the readiness and ability of his Prince to help him, and hath free leave given him, on any occasion, to come immediately unto him, and is

is frequently invited for that effect) will choose to waive this freedom of his access, and will apply himself to some inferiour Officer or Favourite to make his Address? This is our case; God hath invited all that are in Trouble to come immediasly unto himself, and hath frequently promised to grant all their requests who seek him with their whole Hearts; and hath appointed his own Son (God with himself) the Master of Requests, from time to time to receive all the Petitions of his Subjects; and both the one and the other are infinitely more able, and infinitely more willing to Hear and Succour them, than the best, the wisest, and most powerful of all created Beings: And shall we now be afraid to take that Liberty which God hath given us? Shall we call that Impudence, which God hath made our Duty? And whilst we pretend Humility, shall we forfeit our Allegiance, and distrust his Promises, and suspect the goodness of his Nature, for fear of being found too saucy, and too bold with his Person?

9. Since *Deut.* 13. we are expressly forbidden to hearken to any Prophet, tho a Worker of Miracles, who teacheth the Worship of any other Being beside the one Supreme God; may it not pertinently be demanded, if Christ and his Apostles had taught the Worship of Saints and Angels, had it not been a just Reason for the Unbelief of the Jews, notwithstanding of all the Miracles wrought by them?

10. If Ten thousand Miracles should convince a Christian of the Lawfulness of Praying to Saints departed, whilst he hath such a plain express Law against believing all Miracles upon any such account: For if ever real Miracles were wrought at the Tombs of Martyrs, it was in Testimony of the Truth of Christianity, for which they suffered, not to betray any to a Superstitious or Idolatrous Worship of them: tho there is most forcible reason to doubt of many of those pretended Miracles, if ever they were *in rerum natura*, and to fear that many of them were but Satanical Illusions.

11. Can there be a solid Reason assigned why Sacrifice as well as Prayer may not be an Act of inferiour, as well as superiour Worship, since the Heathens offered Sacrifice to their Inferiour Demons as well as to the Supreme?

12. Since the Roman Doctors grant that the difference betwixt Supreme and Subordinate Worship doth not consist in the outward Act, and that all the outward Acts may belong to both kinds (Sacrifice only excepted by them, which the Spirit of God notwithstanding makes inferiour to Prayer) now it may be demanded, since the Law did forbid the external acts of Worship without any regard to the Intention of the Worshipper, doth it not appear from this, that this Idolatrous Worship was to be punished with Death, *Deut.* 13? and therefore it must be such

Such external Idolatry as falls under the Recognition of Humane Judicatures, which Intention doth not, unless a Man had confessed his Intention.

13. When can it be shewn that those Fathers (whose Authority is urged by the Church of *Rome* for the Invocation of Saints) do dogmatically and positively assert the Lawfulness of Praying to Saints and Angels, since many Fathers of the same Age do positively deny the Lawfulness of it ; is it not a plain Argument, that it was not the Judgment and Practice of the Church, and a good reasonable Presumption, that these Fathers (in their Apostrophes and Protopopeia's) never intended any such thing in what they said, how lyable soever their Words may be to be expounded in such a sense ?

14. May it not easily be imagin'd, wherefore the late Latin Editions (in the Church of *Rome*) of the 35th Canon of the Council of *Laodicea*, instead of its prohibiting the Faithful to call on the Name of Angels, have put in *Angulos* (corners) contrary to all the Greek Copies, and Fathers that writ them, and so have made nonsense of that excellent Canon ? but *veritas non querit Angulos* : And the mischief of these Prevaricators is, that there is no resemblance in the Greek (which is the Original Language of the Canon) betwixt the words which signify Angels and Angles.

---

## S E C T. VI.

### *The Doctrin of Merit.*

Qn. 1. If the Doctrine of Merit of good Works (as it is taught in the *Roman Church* by an Analogy, or due proportion betwixt the Work and the Reward, as if God were unjust if he gave it not ; but not as it imports a Reward *Virtute promissi Divini*, as the Fathers teach) be not perfect nonsense in Divinity ? Since our Saviour hath expressly said, *When we have done all that we can do, we are but unprofitable Servants* ; we have done nothing but what was our Duty ; and the Apostle hath told us, *That the light Afflictions of this Life, are not worthy to be compared with that great measure of Glory which shall be revealed* : besides that other consideration, that all we are, and have of any goodness, are graciously derived from that inexhaustible Fountain ; so that neither Men nor Angels can properly Merit at the hands of God.

2. Since the Popes pretend, that they have thrown into the Treasure of the Church, the *Superplus* of the Merits of some eminent Saints ; may

may it not be pertinently doubted; if they believe the Foundation of that Treasure, I mean the merits of Holy Jesus to be infinit, seeing what is really infinit, can neither admit of Addition or Diminution, at least needs no Addition?

## S E C T. VII.

### *Of Purgatory.*

*Qu. 1.* If the Pope hath Power to take all Souls out of that imaginary Purgatory; how comes it, that he is so unmerciful, as not to rid many thousands of Poor Ones from those Flames (which are intensively no better than the torments of Hell) is it because those tormented Wretches have not Heirs and Executors behind them with Purses so flush as those of the Rich?

2. Is it possible to find an account of Indulgences in the Primitive Times, in any other sense, than that of relaxation of Penances inflicted upon scandalous Persons by the Governors of the Church?

3. Since the most Primitive Fathers by a purging Fire for Sinners, do generally understand the Fire of Conflagration in the last Day; with what face can it be pretended that they believed the Romish Purgatory, where poor Creatures suffer the Torments of Hell for a time?

4. Since the Greek Church never believed the Roman Purgatory; how can it be said with any colour of Truth, that it is a Catholick Tradition of the Universal Church, seeing the extent of the Greek Church is nothing inferiour to that of the Roman? The same Question may be proposed concerning the Pope's Supremacy, the Mutilation of the Sacrament of the Eucharist, Service in an unknown Tongue, the Celibacy of the Clergy, and many other particulars in Controversie at this time.

5. If we were to understand 1 Cor. 3. of Purgatory; I would demand of those Glossators, how they reconcile the Doctrine of their Prophets and Apostles, Confessours and Martyrs, the Blessed Virgin, with the Thief on the Crois, that they went immediately to Heaven, or Paradise at least; since the Apostle tells us there, that every man's Work must be tryed by Fire, of what sort it is; which note of Universality in the Eyes of a Puny Logician, comprehends the whole Race of Adam.

6. With what Confidence can the Roman Church boast of Antiquity in Behalf of Purgatory, or Indulgences, seeing it is not able to produce any one Prayer (publick or private) nor one Indulgence, for the Delivery of any Soul out of Purgatory, in all the Primitive times, or out of their own ancient Missals or Records?

## S E C T. VIII.

## Their Seven Sacraments.

*Ques.* Since before Peter Lombard's time the number of Sacraments was indefinit in the Church of *Rome* it self, if so be they have gathered the number of Seven from the Fathers Writings (as they pretend, for I am sure in Scripture they find them not) it may be pertinently demanded, wherefore not seventy seven? seeing the Fathers call many other things Sacraments; yea, if that general Rule assigned by St. *Augustin* be observed in the Computation, *viz.* that all Signs, when they belong to Divine things, are called Sacraments, they would be found no ways short of the greatest number.

---

## S E C T. IX.

*The Priest's Intention in Baptism.*

*Ques.* What can in reason be answered to that objection of the Bishop of *Minori* in the Council of *Trent*, who said that if they should ratife (as afterwards they most unhappily did) the Decree of the *Florinin Council*, concerning the necessity of a right Intention of the Priest in the Administration of Sacraments (especially of Baptism) it would evidently follow, that it were in the Power of one single Priest, who came to be old in Wickedness, to damn his whole Parish? Yea, suppose that Hellish Paroxysm did but once overtake him, that Child not rightly Baptized by him, might afterwards become a Bishop; so that not only his own Ordination, but also all the Orders conferred by him, would become invalid, which might occasion a world of Mischief.

---

## S E C T. X.

*The Limbo of Unbaptized Infants.*

*Ques.* Since many Infants are still-born, and some dye in their Mothers Womb, all which, because unbaptized, must go to that Limbo of Infants, according to the Doctrine of the Roman Church, where they are for ever to be deprived of the beatific

cal Vision, which is the greatest of the Plagues of the Damned (*Pena Damni* being in the Opinion of the School-men and Fathers, much greater than *Pena Sensus*) how can that rigid Opinion be reconciled to the infinit Goodness and Wisdom of God, to appoint a means indispensably necessary to Salvation, which in some circumstances cannot possibly be administered; and may not those cruel Opiniators be justly termed Step-fathers of Infants, as St. *Augustin* was named *Durus Pater Infantum?*

### SECT. XI.

#### Of Transubstantiation.

Qu. 1. Since the most eminent of the Roman School-men, such as *Scorus, Durandus, Alfonsus a Castro, Sharez, Vasquez, Alfonso, Biel, Cams, Octam, Cajetan, and Bellarmine* himself, confess that the Doctrine of Transubstantiation cannot be evidently proved from Scripture; and that there is no absolute necessity of understanding our Saviour's Words in that Sense; may it not be pertinently demanded, is there not a great deal of reason to understand them otherwise, seeing that strange Sense is so directly repugnant to the Senses of all that are endued with an animal Life?

2. Since there be so many parallel places in Scripture, which every man understands in a figurative, and not in a strictly literal and absurd Sense; as where the Lamb is called the Passover; Circumcision God's Covenant; the Church Christ's Body; the Rock which followed the *Israelites*, called Christ; Christ calleth himself the Door, the true Vine (which the Church of *Rome* would mightily have triumphed in, if he had said, this is my true Body) wherefore may we not also understand these Words, *This is my Body*, in a Metaphorical Sense, especially considering, that it is impossible to make sense of the whole Words of the Institution, without more Figures than one?

3. Can it rationally be presumed, that any sensible Man, who had never heard of Transubstantiation being grounded on these Words, *This is my Body*, would upon reading the Institution of the Eucharist, ever have imagined any such thing to be meant by our Saviour in these words; but rather, that this Bread signifies my Body, and this Cup my Blood, and this which ye see me now do, do ye hereafter for a Memorial of me? Far less would it have entred into any Man's Mind (not blinded with gross Error or Prejudice) to have thought that our Saviour did literally hold himself in his Hand, and did eat himself, and that

he gave away himself from himself with his own Hands ; especially if it be further considered, that our Saviour having pronounced these words, (*This is my Body which is broken, and my Blood which is shed*) before his Passion, this could not be true in a literal Sense ; for his Body was then unbroken, and his Blood unshed, unless they will say that Propitiation was made before Christ suffered : Nor could the Apostles understand these words literally, since they both saw and tasted what he gave them to be Bread and Wine ; and that it was not his Body which was given, but his Body which gave that which was given : Whence any rational Man may infer, that St. *Augustin*'s Phrase (in his Enarrations on the Psalms) *Christus portavit se manibus suis*, is to be understood figuratively, according to his own Rule for interpreting Scripture, given *Lib. 3, de Doctr. Christ. cap. 16.*

4. May not the Church of *Rome* as well conclude from *1 Cor. 10. 17.* that all Christians are substantially changed into one Bread, and then into the natural Body of Christ, by the participation of the Sacrament, because they are said to be one Bread, and one Body, as to infer Transubstantiation from the Verse immediately foregoing, or from any other place of Scripture ?

5. Suppose *Justin Martyr*, (who lived, *An. 150.*) *Ireneus*, (who lived, *An. 180.*) *Tertullian*, (who lived, *An. 206.*) *Origen*, (who lived, *An. 230.*) *St. Cyprian*, who lived *An. 250.*) *Theodore*, (who lived *An. 450.*) *P. Gelasius*, (who also lived in the Fifth Century,) and *Facundus the African Bishop*, (who lived in the Sixth) had not written any thing against Transubstantiation (as it is simply impossible to make sense of their Writings, if they believed that Doctrine) and not to speak of many other Testimonies of St. *Augustin* against Transubstantiation ; I would demand if any Man in his right Wits that had believed Transubstantiation, could have uttered such a Testimony against it ; as we find *lib. 3. de Doctr. Christ. cap. 16.* (already cited) where laying down several Rules for the right understanding of Scripture, he gives this for one ; *If (says he) the Speech be a Precept forbidding some heinous Crime, or commanding us to do good, it is not figurative ; but if it seem to command any heinous wickedness, or to forbid that which is profitable to others, it is figurative : for Example, Except ye eat the Flesh of the Son of Man, and drink his Blood, ye have no Life in you ; this seems to command an heinous Wickedness, therefore it is a Figure, commanding us to Communicate of the Passion of our Lord, and with delight and advantage to lay up in our Memory that his Flesh was crucify'd and wounded for us.*

6. Since *Bellarmin* (in *lib. descript. Eccles. an. 118.*) tells us, that *Passchasius Rabertus* Abbot of *Corbey*, was the first who did write seriously concerning the Truth of Christ's Body and Blood in the Eucharist ; it may

may be demanded very pertinently, if any of the Fathers before him wrote in jest concerning such a sublime Mystery ?

7. Since some of the Fathers have as high Elegies of the Sacrement of Baptism, as of the Eucharist ; notwithstanding the Popish Schoolmen grant there is no substantial Change made in that consecrated Water, and yet that the Divine Blessing accompanying the Institution, it may be effectual to the washing away of Sin, and Spiritual Regeneration ; what reason can be given why the Elements of Bread and Wine in the Lord's Supper may not by the same Divine Blessing accompanying this Institution, make all the worthy Receivers Partakers of all the Spiritual Comfort designed to us thereby, without any substantial Change made in those Elements, since our Saviour hath told us, that verily the Flesh profiteth nothing ?

8. If the Canibals be abhorred as Inhuman for eating the Flesh of their Enemies, must it not be great Inhumanity to eat the Flesh of a Friend, and the best in the World ? If none can read without horrour, the Stories of *Tereus*, *Thyestes*, and *Harpagus*, their eating of their own Children, (though ignorantly) how much more horrible must it be to feed upon the very Body of the Son of God (that was Born of the Virgin) knowingly ? ( *Deum suum primo conficiunt, deinde devorant* ; said *Averrhoes*, justly deriding that prodigious Doctrine, which a little before his time began to be publickly taught in the *Roman Church* ) and with what Face could the Primitive Apologists upbraid the Heathen then with one of their Gods, who did eat his own Children, if the Christians had believed at that time, that they did Eat their own God ? and that no such thing being then objected by the Pagans to the Christians, is to a Wise Man instead of a Thousand Demonstrations, that no such Doctrine was then believed : for the Impiety and Barbarousness of the thing, as it is believed and practised in the *Roman Church*, is not in truth extenuated, but only the appearance of it, by being done under the Species of Bread and Wine ; for the thing they acknowledge is really done, and they believe, they verily Eat and Drink the Natural Flesh and Blood of Christ : And suppose a man should eat his Son in a Pasty ( where the Figure of the Body is so altered, that it cannot be easily known to be human Flesh ; or so minced and aromatized, that the Taste can no more discern what it is, than *Minodoe* could tell of what Ingredients the fifty Dishes at the *Mogul's* Table were compounded, though his Curiosity led him to taste of them all ) yet if the Father know it, it can no ways excuse him from unnatural Barbarity.

9. How can any Romanist ascertain himself free of Idolatry, without Divine Revelation ? For if Transubstantiation be not true, by their

their own Confession, they are certainly guilty of the most damnable Idolatry in the World, in Worshiping a piece of Bread as God; and suppose such a change could be, they can never be certain that it is, since according to the Councils of *Florence* and *Trent*, the Validity of the Consecration depends on the Intention of the Priest, which cannot be known assuredly without Divine Revelation: neither is it sufficient to excuse them from Idolatry, that they intended to Worship God, and not a Creature; for so all the Idolatry that ever was in the World may be excused, which was nothing else but a mistake of the Deity; and upon that mistake, a Worshiping of something, that was not God, as God.

10. Suppose a Miracle were produced to prove the Truth of Transubstantiation, may it not be demanded, to what purpose is that production, seeing we cannot believe the Miracle, unless it be obvious to some of our Senses? and then the Argument for Transubstantiation, and the Objection against it, would just ballance one another; so that in this case, a Miracle would signify nothing, because that would be to prove to a man by something that he sees, that he does not see, what he sees.

11. If the Senses of all mankind may be deluded, what Evidence have we for the Passion and Resurrection of Christ? (Suppose we had seen them with our Eyes, and not only heard of them with our Ears) for if in the matter of Bread and Wine, all our Senses ( save one) are deceived, why might not one have been deluded in reference to the Humiliation and Exaltation of Christ; so that we might have as easily mistaken an Image for a living man upon the Cross, as to imagine a piece of Bread to be the true Body of a man, and that a living Human Body is to be found in every Atome thereof?

12. Whereas its said in the Institution, that Christ's Body is broken for us, and yet the Doctrine of the *Roman* Church is, that it is broken into Wholes, and not into Parts; doth not this clearly imply a Contradiction, that Christ's Body is broken and not broken, at the self same time, or that it is whole and not whole.

13. Doth it not involve horrible Impieties, to imagine that the glorified Body of our Saviour, should be contracted to the Crum of a Wafer? That he should be perfectly deprived of Sense and Reason? That he should not be able to defend himself against the Assaults of the most contemptible Vermine? That if the Stomach of the Communicant chance to be overcharged with Wine, that he should be Vomited up again; or if he have a *Lienteria*, that he should go wholly to the Draught?

14. Since the Apostle, *1 Cor. 10.* tells us expressly, That the Fathers did eat the same Spiritual Meat, and Drink the same Spiritual Drink which we do ; may it not be pertinently demanded, if the *Manna*, and Rock which followed them, were Transubstantiated into the Body and Blood of Christ ? Or may not Believers under the Gospel, feed upon Christ in a Spiritual and Mystical Sense (as the Fathers did under the Law) without any Transubstantiation of the Elements ?

15. Since our Saviour, *John 6.* saith, *That he who Eats his Flesh, and Drinks his Blood, hath Eternal Life* ; how can this be applyed to Transubstantiation, unless any be so absurd as to imagin, That all who partake of those Consecrated Elements shall be saved ?

16. Since the *Cartesian* Philosophers have (by irrefragable Reasons) demonstrated, that the Nature of all real Bodies must needs consist in extension, or (as they phrase it) the having *partes extra partes* ; (it being simply impossible to conceive an indivisible Atome, (or least particle of matter) which is laid on a plain, to touch it in all parts, but that the Superior Portion thereof, must be without the contact of that plain (where there is no penetration) if therefore Christ's Body be reduced to an indivisible point by Transubstantiation, it may be pertinently demanded, if this Opinion doth not reduce the Body of Christ to the Nature of a Spirit ; and consequently, is a worse Heresie than the Phantaftical Body of the *Marcionites* ?

17. Since divers of the ancient Fathers improved the Doctrine of the Eucharist in order to the Confutation of the *Eutychian* Heresie, had it not been perfect non-sense in them to have avowed from such a Topick (if they had believed Transubstantiation) which did apparently afford a great Instance to the *Eutychians* against them ?

## S E C T. XII.

### Of the Propitiatory Sacrifice of the Mass.

Qu. 1. **S**ince in a true Sacrifice, the Thing sacrificed must be destroyed ; and if it have Life it must be killed ; it may be demanded, if Christ be truly and properly Sacrificed (as the Romanists will have it) is he not truly and properly put to Death as oft as the Priest says Mass ? which is directly contrary to *Heb. 10. & 11. Cap.*

2. Whereas the Apostle argues the perfection of Christ's Sacrifice above those of the Law, because those were offered year by year, but the Sacrifice of Christ's Body was offered once for all ; if Christ be daily Sacrificed in the Mass, must not the Sacrifice of Christ be much more defective.

defective than those of the Law ; since one Sacrifice of Expiation for the whole Congregation of *Israel*, was thought sufficient for the whole year ? whereas the Sacrifice of Christ's Body is repeated every day ; yea, for one single person, he may be Sacrificed a Thousand times over, if we may believe the Doctrine of that Church.

3. How could that be a Propitiatory Sacrifice at the first Institution, which was previous to Christ's Death ? unless they will say, that Propitiation was made before Christ suffered : though with divers of the ancient Fathers, we are still ready to acknowledge the Eucharist to be a Commemorative Sacrifice ; and its possible, that the Error of the Romanists had its rise therefrom.

---

### S E C T. XIII.

#### *Of private Masses.*

*Quest.* **I**S it possible to reconcile the Solitary Mass (wherein the Priest Communiques alone after he hath Consecrated) to the Institution of Christ, the practice of the Primitive Church, or with the very nature and intendment of that Sacrament ; or with the *Roman* Office as it now stands ; or if there can be any instance given of Solitary Masses before *Gregory the Great* dyed, which was 600 years after Christ ?

---

### S E C T. XIV.

#### *Of the Sacrament of Penance.*

*Qn. 1.* **W**hen *Nectarius*, with his Church of *Constantinople*, discharged for ever the Office of Penitentiaries, because of a scandalous Deacon ; can it rationally be presumed, that this Office was ever reputed by them a Sacrament, but rather at the best, an Expedient to prepare men for it ? for we are bound in Charity to think, that neither the Bishop, nor that Church, would have ever consented to the Abolition of a Sacrament, for the sake of such a Scandal as happened in the mis-management of it ; or if they had done so, much less can it be imagined that the greatest part of the Christian Church would have concurred with them in it. Moreover, since the ancient Church had no Form of Absolution, but only the admitting Penitents to the Communion, where then shall the Form of that pretended Sacrament be found among the Ancients ?

2. If

2. If the Absolution of a *Roman Priest* hath the power to convert Attrition ( that is, such a consternation of mind as fell upon *Judas* when he went and hanged himself ) into the Grace of Contrition ( as divers Popish *Casuists* aver ) had it not been an unspeakable happiness to that Betrayer of the best Master that ever was, to have renounted ( in the way of striving ) such a Priest, when he was seeking after some Instrument to become *Felo de se*.

---

### S E C T. XV.

#### *Of the Sacrament of Marriage, with the Clergies restraint therefrom.*

Qn. 1. **I**FF Marriage be a Sacrament, and confer Grace, as Baptism and the Eucharist ; wherefore do they restrain their Consecrated Persons from that supernatural Quality ; since its only an Ecclesiastical Restraint they pretend unto ?

2. Since God hath sufficiently declared his Approbation of the Marriage of the Clergy, in that the whole World hath been twice ( by his Appointment ) Peopled by Two married Priests, *viz. Adam and Noah* ; and that he tyed the Priesthood under the Law, to a Race of married People ; and that the Scripture hath told us, *Marriage is honourable in all* ; and placeth it among the Qualifications of a Bishop, *That he be the Husband of one Wife*, having faithful Children ( not to speak of that Canon of the Council of *Gangra*, nor of the Discourse of *Paphnutius* in the Council of *Nice*, nor of *Spiridion, S. Hilary, Eucherius Lugdunensis*, and many other Primitive Bishops ; who were married, beside the Apostle *S. Peter* : ) may it not be pertinently enquired, if the Church of *Rome* borrowed their Doctrine of the unlawfulness of the Marriage of Priests, from the *Manichees*, who allowed Marriage to their Hearers ( as the Church of *Rome* doth to *Laicks* ) but forbad it to their Elect, as that Church doth to her Priests ?

3. Had not *Eneas Sylvius* ( afterwards *P. Pius the 2d.* ) good reason to write, that ( in consideration of the vile Abuses of the Celibacy of the Clergy ) whatever reasons the Clergy had at first to restrain them from Marriage, now for much better Reasons they ought to be restored to that which God hath made the Privilege of all men who cannot contain ?

## S E C T. XVI.

*Of the Sacrament of Extreme Unction.*

**Ques.** Suppose the Administration of Extreme Unction to dying persons, as a Sacrament, had been the Doctrine and Practice of the Catholick Church in all Ages (though for a Thousand years after Christ we find no such thing) how can the Practice of the Roman Church be reconciled to the Doctrine of S. James, or S. Mark (for these are their Scripture-pretences) who manifestly shew us, that the design of that Anointing was the recovery of the Patient; (the gift of miraculous Healing not being ceased in the days of S. James) whereas the Romanists do not practise that Ceremony, till all hope of Recovery is past?

## S E C T. XVII.

*Of Tradition.*

**Qu. 1.** Of those who magnifie the Tradition of the Church so highly, as to imagin that the very Credit of the Scripture depends thereon, or that it gives the Scripture its Authority (which is as much as to say, that Man gives Authority to Gods Word) it may be demanded, What if the Church should have concealed, or taught otherwise of those Writings, than as of the undoubted Oracles of God, would she not have erred damnably in her Tradition?

2. Since Tradition in the Roman Church is taken in, to supply the Imaginary defect of Scripture, and the Authority thereof to supply the defect of Tradition; doth it not hence follow, that neither Scripture nor Tradition, signifie any thing without the Churches Authority? And consequently, it must needs be the Rule of their Faith; that is, *They believe themselves.*

3. Since the Doctrine of the Millenaries was unanimously received as an Apostolick Tradition in the 2d and 3d Centuries of the Church, meerly upon the Authority and Antiquity of *Papias*, who lived presently after the Apostles; (and yet by St. *Hierom*, and many of this present Age, looked upon as an Imposture) and if both *Ireneus* for his asserting that our Saviour suffered about the Fiftieth year of his Age, and *Clem. Alexandrinus*, that he died for the Sins of the World about the Thirtieth year of his Age, are judged exceedingly mistaken, (and not

not without good ground ) notwithstanding they both pretended an Apostolick Tradition, as having conversed with Apostolick Men ; (*Irenaeus* having written *An. 180.* and *Clemens 190.*) And in fine, since in that famous contention about *Easter* ( which miserably afflicted the Church in the days of *P. Victor*, Bishop of *Rome*, by dividing the Eastern Christians from the Western ; one pretending Oral Tradition from *S. John* and *S. Philip*, and the other from *S. Peter* and *S. Paul* ) may it not be pertinently demanded, What stress can be laid upon a pretence of Apostolick Tradition sixteen hundred years after Christ, ( suppose it were now become Universal ) but especially, when it is but the particular Tradition of a particular Church ?

4. What greater certainty can be given, of the uncertainty of Oral Tradition ( as it is contradistinguished from the Scripture ) than this consideration, that of all Christ said ( and no doubt he spoke much in point of Morality, which is not expressed in the Gospels ) nothing is found in any Authentick Record ( save the Scriptures ) except that one expression preserved by *S. Hierom*, *Be thou never merry, unless thou see thy Brother living in Charity* ; for which notable expression, we have the sole Authority of *S. Hierom* ?

5. Since its evident from the penult of *S. John's* Gospel at the end, as also the close of the last Chapter, *That our Saviour did many great things, which are not recorded in Holy Scripture* ; is it not a great Evidence of the great uncertainty of Oral Tradition, that none of all those Miracles not found in Scripture, are conveyed to us by any warrantable Record ? the Legends which contain some of those pretended Miracles, being rejected as Fabulous by the best Criticks of the Roman Church.

---

### S E C T. XVIII.

*Of that Thred-bare question, Where was your Church before Luther ?*

Qu. 1. **O**f those who are still harping on that *Thred-bare Question*, *Where was your Church before Luther* ? May it not as pertinently be demanded, Should a Revolt happen from the Reformed Church of *England* to *Romanism* again, ( which God forbid ) where was your Religion before 86, or before such a time ? Would they not answer, at *Rome*, and in *England* also ; only kept under, and obscured by Hereticks ? And Christianity, though not so visible, yet was purer, when its Professors dwelt in Mountains and Dens, ( places of Obscurity

rity and Privacy) in the Reigns of *Nero*, *Decius*, and *Dioclesian*, than when some Kings were called its Nursing Fathers, and took possession of the seven Halls, as when it groaned under *Arianism* in the days of *Constantius* and *Valens*.

2. When some peremptorily require from us the *Aera* of all the Popish Errors; may it not be as pertinently demanded, when the *Acephali* began, (which was such a ridiculous Linsy-Wolsey Heresie, as to be a Compound of these Contraries, *Nestorianism* and *Eutychianism*, and yet gave great trouble to the Church for many years) for *Baronius* and *Bellarmin* ingenuously acknowledge, that they know neither the *Heretarch*, or the *Epocha* of the Heresie; nor when *Filioq*; was inserted by the Latin Church, into the Creed; and if they know not the *Aera* of their Truths, how can it be rationally expected that we should design the precise times when all their Errors began, since its in the Night Season, that the Adversary Sows his Tares in the Field of the Church?

3. It may be demanded, what more pertinency (amongst Disputers) is in that old *Thred-bare Question*, *Where was your Church, or Religion, before Luther*; than in this amongst Husbandmen, *Where was the Corn before it was Weeded*? For if our Forefathers under the Papacy, embraced the true Faith, we have it still; the Faith not being removed, but the Corruption.

4. Since the Church of *England* obligeth none to believe any thing as necessary to Salvation, but what is plainly proved from holy Scripture; and intirely holds the Apostolick, *Nicene*, and *Athanasian* Creeds; and obeys more Canons of the first general Councils, than those of *Rome* do; and approves that Exposition of Scripture, which hath the consent of the Fathers of the four first Centuries: Yea, holds all that the Church of *Rome* held necessary for Salvation for five or six hundred years together; so that a Romanist may turn Protestant, without adding any Article to his Faith; but a Protestant cannot turn Romanist, without the addition of many new ones, or novel Inventions, which have neither Foundation in Scripture, nor genuin Antiquity: May it not then be most rationally concluded, that the Protestant way is the surest and safest, because both sides agree therein; and that their Church was, long before Papacy appeared in the World?

5. Since its impossible to produce any genuin Work of any of the Fathers, who lived within Four Hundred Years after Christ, that positively asserts the practice or the lawfulness of Prayer in an unknown Tongue, of taking away the Cup from the People, or with-holding the Scriptures from the Laicks, or Adoring Images, or having them in

in Churches, the Pope's Infallibility or Supremacy, Indulgences (in the Sense of Pope *Leo the Tenth*) the Doctrine of Merit, (in the Sense of the Council of *Trent*) that there are neither more nor less than Seven Sacraments, the necessity of the right Intention of the Priest for the Validity of a Sacrament, Transubstantiation, the Limbo of unbaptized Infants, Private Masses, the Popes deposing Power, &c. may it not more pertinently be demanded of the Romanists, Where was Popery before *Boniface the Third*, than they can enquire of the Protestants, Where was your Church before *Luther* ?

6. Since its impossible to find any of the Primitive Fathers (or any Christian Writer a thousand years after Christ and more,) who believed all the Twelve new Articles of Faith, which *P. Pius* the Fourth hath added to the Apostolick Creed ; may it not be pertinently demanded of the Romanists, Where was your Faith to be found intirely before the Council of *Trent* ? And is not the Modern Papacy younger by many years than *Martin Luther* himself ?

7. Since not one of the Twelve new Articles of the Creed of *P. Pius* the Fourth is to be found in any ancient Creed or Confession of Faith generally allowed in the Christian Church, (whence it is evident that they are Innovations destitute of Primitive Authority) may we not more pertinently demand of them, Where was Papacy when those Confessions were framed ? than they can enquire of us, Where was your Church before *Luther* ?

8. Since every true Reformation necessarily pre-supposeth Corruptions and Errors to have been before it, what Advantage can the Romanists have in charging our Reformation with Novelty ? For if a real Reformation be made, the thing justifies it self, and a Reformation must begin sometime, and when ever it begins, it is certainly new : Besides, it ought to be considered, that this Objection of Novelty lies against all Reformation whatsoever; tho never so necessary, and tho things be never so much amiss : So that tho our Reformation was as late as *Luther*, our Religion is as antient as Christianity it self ; for when the Additions which the Church of *Rome* hath made to the antient Christian Faith, and their Innovations in Practice are par'd off, that which remains of their Religion is ours ; and this they cannot deny to be every tittle of it the antient Christianity : And what other Answer, I pray, could the *Jews* have given to the like Question, if it had been put to them by the Antient Idolaters of the World, Where was your Religion before *Abraham or Moses* ? Or what other Answer could the Primitive Christians have given to those Pagans, who pretended Venerable Antiquity and Universality for their Polytheisme, but the very same in substance, which we now give to the Church of *Rome* ? And if

if any be so fond as to brand the Protestant Religion with Novelty, because of some negative Articles (in opposition to the Corruptions of the Roman Church, which by accident are become a part of our Faith, occasioned by their Errors) they may as well tax the Primitive Church with Novelty, because the renouncing of the Doctrines of *Arianism* at the Council of *Nice*, of *Macedonianism* at the Council of *Constantinople*, of *Nestorianism* at *Ephesus*, and of *Eutychianism* at *Calcedon*, came a part of the Catholick Religion after the rise of those Heresies.

9. But, (to shut up this Point) if to Pray without Understanding, to obey without Reason, and to believe against Sense, be the surest Evidences of the Antiquity of a Church, then I pray where is that Protestant to be found, who is so contentious for Priority, as not to yield (upon these accounts) the Precedency to the Church of *Rome* above all Christian Societies in the World ?

---

### S E C T. XIX.

#### *Of the Infallibility of the Pope with his Councils.*

*Qu. 1.* If the Pope or Church of *Rome* be infallible, wherefore are they so uncharitable to the World (at least to their own Incorporation) as not to give an infallible Comment on Scripture, but suffers her Doctors to write as fallible Comments, and in many things as contrary to each other, as any Protestant Divines do ? And I cannot imagine what good Infallibility does, if an infallible Church has no better means of understanding Scripture, than the Comments of fallible Men, that is, no better means then every fallible Church hath ?

2. When the Doctors of the Roman Church vye Reasons and Arguments with us Hereticks, and dispute from Scripture and Antiquity, (especially in order to the establishing that beloved *Palladium* of their Churches Authority and Infallibility, which those crois-grain'd Hereticks deny) do they not appeal from the Infallibility of the present Church, to every Man's private Reason and Judgment, as much as every Protestant does ? For its against the very Principles of Philosophy, to imagin that the Churches Authority can be a sufficient Topick to prove it self.

3. If a visible uninterrupted Succession be the Mark of such a true Church, as is the infallible Interpreter of Scripture (as some Romanists aver) wherefore is not the *Greek* Church an infallible Interpreter of Scripture, since she hath as visible and uninterrupted Succession from

from Christ and his Apostles to this Day, as the Church of *Rome* has? yea, if we consult the Catalogues of their Patriarchs of *Alexandria* and *Antioch*, we shall not find so many Chafina's occasioned (in those Lists) by Schisms, as in the See of *Rome*.

4. Since P. *Zachary* deposed *Vigilius* Bishop of *Salzburg*, as an Heretick, because he truly maintained, (tho in a very ignorant Age) the Doctrine of Antipodes; may it not be pertinently demanded, may not he who can mistake Truth for Heretie, also mistake Heresie for Truth? as no doubt P. *Liberius*, *Vigilius*, and *Honorius* did.

5. Since its confessed by *Bellarmino* (and divers other eminent Champions for that Church) that the Popes Canonizations are doubtful and subject to Error; may it not be pertinently demanded, if his Infallibility should chance at any time to mistake (as I am pretty sure he hath done more than once) in what a pitiful case are the Members of that Church, who are obliged to invoke such mistaken Saints? Would not that be Idolatry?

6. Since in the first and last Ages of the Church, there were many Schisms and Heresies, which (if we believe *Irenaeus*, who lived in the Second Century) were as wild and extravagant as any of later date; now if the Fathers who lived in these Primitive Ages believed the Infallibility of the Roman Church at that time, may it not be pertinently demanded, Was there no Prudence amongst them all in going so far about by their endeavours to bring those Hereticks and Schismatics to the Touch-stone of the Scripture, and next to that, to the most Orthodox and Catholick Tradition? whereas how short and easie a Decision to all Debates might have been fetched hence, had they had the same Apprehension of the Authority and Efficacy thereof, by referring all Controversies depending to the determination of the Roman Church (the Mother and Mistress of all) and that infallible Conduct settled therein? But not one word of that, which makes it more than probable, that such holy and wise men knew no such thing; only when they make their Appeals to her after the express word of God, its in common with many other Churches, especially those of Apostolical Foundation, as is evident from *Irenaeus*, *Tertullian*, and St. *Augustin*, when they had to deal with such Persons.

7. How can any rational man imagin that the Popes or Roman Councils (which they account General) are infallible, even when they are confirmed by Popes, unless Errors become Truths, and Contradictions be reconciled when determined by a Pope and Council? Since P. *Vigilius* not only confirmed the Fifth General Council, which formerly he had condemned, but General Councils confirmed by Popes have made Definitions and Decrees plainly contradictory one to another: Thus

the

the Sixth General Council confirmed by Pope *Adrian* the First, defined that Marriage was dissolved by Heresie: And the Council of *Trent*, confirmed by P. *Pius* the Fourth, that it could not be so: The Council of *Constance*, confirmed by Pope *Martin* the Fifth, decreed, that a General Council was superior to the Pope: The last *Lateran* Council, under P. *Leo* the Tenth, condemned this Decree; so did it the Decree of P. *Nicholas* the Fifth, who ratified the Council of *Basil*, as a true General Council.

8. How can any doubt that General Councils confirmed by Popes, may err? since it is so manifest they have actually erred, by making Decrees so apparently contradictory to the Plain Words and Sense of Holy Scripture, that no impartial Person can any more question it, than he can, whether Theft be forbidden by the Eighth Commandment: So did the Council of *Constance*, confirmed by P. *Martin* the Fifth, and *Trent*, by P. *Pius* the Fourth, the former in the Decree for Laicks Communicating in one kind only, notwithstanding (as themselves acknowledge) that Christ instituted the Sacrament in both kinds, and delivered it in both to his Disciples: The latter in decreeing, that Divine Service should not be in the Vulgar Tongue, in plain Contradiction to what St. *Paul* prescribes in 1 *Cor.* 14, not to speak that the Pope's Confirmation of Doctrinal Definitions, is but a meer Ceremony; it being impossible for any man to make that become true, which is false; or that which is false, to become true.

9. Since from the fitness of an infallible visible Judge for the Militant Church, the Romanists are apt to pretend that God hath actually appointed such an one, without which, God (say they) had not made sufficient Provisions for the Assurance of Man's Faith, and for the Peace and Unity of his Church (or, as it is with a strange kind of Civility expressed in their Canon Law, *Aliter Dominus non videretur fusse discreitus*, otherwise our Lord had not seem'd to be discreet) may it not be very pertinently urged from this Topick of Humane Appearance, that it had been yet more useful for the Church, that not only the first Patriarch, but all of them, had been infallible; yea, and all the Bishops, and Presbyters of the Church; and if all men had been infallible, certainly the Church of God should never have been troubled with any Error whatsoever, but the experience of the World demonstrates that it is not so.

10. If it be a fit Argument always to conclude that God hath done such a thing, because the generality of Men judge it expedient to be done; may it not be pertinently demanded, where is that man, who consulting with Flesh and Blood (I mean Humane Reason) who would not have thought it very fit, that our Saviour, after his Resurrection, should

should have publickly taught the People of *Hierusalem* in the Temple, as he used to do, that all the Inhabitants of that great City, (yea, all the Males throughout the Land being obliged to be there also at the Feast of the Passoyer) might by an ocular Demonstration be convinced that our Saviour was not an Impostor, when he said he would rise again the third day ? yet the infinite Wisdom thought it not fit, *For his ways are not as our ways, nor his thoughts as our thoughts*, Isa. 55. 8, 9.

11. Since it is no les behoofful for the Purity of the Militant Church, to be secured from Vice, than from Error, by some infallible means ; and whereas the former is not pretended to by any, is it not very reasonable to put the Romanists to it, to shew from Scripture who this Infallible Visible Judge is who is invested with that Power, or Commission ; especially when it is considered, that our Judge of Controversies in the Church is now become our greatest Controversie ? Besides that, it would puzzle any man to give a good reason why God should take more care to secure men against Errors in Belief, than against Sin and Wickedness in their Lives.

12. If an infallible visible Judge be such an adequate means to determin all Controversies in matters of Religion, which happen in the Militant Church, (as the Romanists pretend) how came it to pass that there were so many Schisms and Heresies too in the Apostles times, when those who govern'd the Church were certainly guided by an Infallible Spirit ?

13. Can the fiercest Bigot of Popery prove from Holy Scripture, that the Pope is infallible ( in the Popish Sense of the World ?) I know that some fly the Absurdity, by hiding the Pope in the Church ; but if the Church be Infallible, it is so as its representative in General Councils, or diffusive in the whole Body of Christians ; and then what is Infallibility to the Church of *Rome*, more than to any other particular Church ? And how shall that which is common to all, give power to one over all ? And what is it to the Pope above another Bishop or Patriarch ?

14. Since the Council of *Trent* hath determined that Infants should not be Communicated, because they cannot examine themselves, nor discern the Lord's Body ; who can doubt but that Popes, with their Councils, and Roman Church, have erred in their Belief and Practice of the Communion of Infants long ago, it being past all doubt that for some Hundreds of Years it was so in the Roman Church ?

15. Was not the Apostle to blame, to say there must be Heresies and Divisions among you, and not to tell them, there must be also an infallible Judge among you to obviate such pertinacious Errors and Schisms, if so be that God had appointed any such infallible visible Judge to be for ever in his Church ?

16. If the many Dissentions in the Protestant Churches (as is pretended) make this infallible visible Judge always necessary, how is it that this sole Remedy is found so ineffectual against the Divisions in the Roman Church, and that there are so many Differences there about Infallibility it self, the manner and subject of it ? so that many Romanists (not of the dullest brains) being ashamed of it, have betaken themselves to Tradition instead thereof.

---

## SECT. XX.

### *Of the Pope's Supremacy.*

*Qu. 1.* Since the Reason assigned by the Council of *Calcedon*, giving equal Priviledges to the Patriarch of *Constantinople* with him of *Rome*, is because old *Bizantium* was become *Nova Roma*, that is, the Emperours had fixed their Habitations there ; might not *Milan* and *Ravenna* have claimed the same Priviledge, seeing some Emperours did honour those Cities with their Presence many years ?

2. Had not the *African* Churches as good reason to decline the pretended Authority of the Bishops of *Rome*, as the Churches of *Cyprus* to reject the Jurisdiction of the Patriarch of *Antioch* (from which liberated at last by the Third General Council) since they had still a Primat of their own ; and were no more within the Roman Patriarchat, than *Cyprus* was within that of *Antioch* ?

3. Since all sober Persons *hinc inde*, acknowledg a Primacy of Order in St. *Peter* (either for his Age, or his being first called to be an Apostle, or for his Zeal, or some other reason best known to his Lord and Master) it being impossible that any Society should remain long without Confusion (far less that it should continue well ordered) which hath not one appointed to be the Mouth thereof ; it may therefore be pertinently demanded if any Romanist can produce any place of Scripture which imports a formal Jurisdiction in St. *Peter*, which was not at some other time vouchsafed on the Catholick Church, at least on the rest of the Apostles ?

4. *Dato sed non concessso*, that St. *Peter* had a Primacy of Jurisdiction over all the General Members of the Catholick Church ; wherefore might not this have been a personal Priviledge and intransmissible to any Successor, no less than the *Gradus Mosaicus* was to any other Prophet ?

5. Upon what Grounds do *Bellarmin* and others call Christ's Ingemination of these Words, *Feed my Sheep*, the peculiar Priviledge of St. *Peter*, above all the rest of the Apostles, since St. *Augustin*, and St. *Cyril*

ril of Alexandria call it the peculiar Penance of St. Peter for denying his Lord and Master, which none of the rest had done ?

6. Since the Primitive Fathers by Rock in the 16th. of St. Matthew, generally understand either Christ himself, or that excellent Confession of St. Peter, where then doth his peculiar Prerogative lye in these Words ?

7. Suppose our Saviour did mean by St. Peter, when he said, *On this Rock will I build my Church*, (alluding to his Name by way of Emphasis, not Exclusion) I pray, where is yet the peculiarity of St. Peter's Privilege, since if we believe either St. Paul, or St. John in his Revelation, the rest of the Apostles were Foundations as well as he ? for I hope none will call him the *Chief Corner-stone*.

8. Since the generality of the ancient Fathers look upon Peter (both in his Excellent Confession, and Promise made to him, as personating the Catholick Church) and that what our Saviour there promised, was after his Resurrection fulfilled, as we may read, *John 20. 21, 22, 23.* Where, I pray you, is St. Peter's special Privilege above the rest of the Apostles, since our Saviour said to them all alike, *As my Father sent me, so send I you* : (and I suppose S. Peter could not have a Sublimer Mission than our Saviour) and breathed upon them all, and said, *Receive ye the Holy Ghost, whose Sins ye remit, &c.*

9. But what ever Sense these Words of St. John may have, or these of St. Matthew, doth it not evidently appear, that what our Saviour promised to St. Peter, *Math. 16.* was given to the Catholick Church, at least to the rest of the Apostles as well as Peter, in *Math. 18. 18.* in the same words of *Mat. 16.* our Saviour himself having expounded the Power of the Keys, by that of Binding and loosing ?

10. Since after that Promise made to St. Peter, *Mat. 18.* we find the Apostles (more than once) controveſting for Superiority ; may it not very rationally be presumed that H. Jesus (the Wisdom of the Father and Prince of Peace) having taken notice of that Ambitious Debate, would once have undeceived them, by telling them, that tho the Despotical Power of the Gentile Kings or Governours should be far removed from them, yet their minds should be at rest, because he had already invested St. Peter with a Paternal Authority or Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction over them, when he promised to him the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven ; but since in our Saviour's reproof we find no such Insinuation, may it not be pertinently doubted if ever he meant any such matter ?

11. I would demand, how the ensuing particulars can be reconciled to a formal Jurisdiction of S. Peter over the rest of the Apostles, 1. The Care of all the Churches being committed to every one of them *in soli-*

dum. 2. St. Peter was sent by the Apostles and Elders at *Hierusalem* to *Samaria* (he that gave the Commission having rather the Authority, than the Person commissionated.) 3. His being called to an account for converting with *Cornelius* the Centurion in *Casarua*, and other Gentiles, by those at *Hierusalem*, *velut vehementur infensi* (as *S. Chrysostom* phraseth it.) 4. If St. Peter was then Supreme Governour, wherefore did not the controverting Christians at *Antioch* address first to him in order to the indicting of a Council? 5. Wherefore did St. James preuide therein, and by his Verdict determine the Controversie (if we believe *Eusebius* and *Epiphanius*) and not St. Peter, on which account, and because he was the first Bishop of *Hierusalem*, and of the Christian World, *Epiphanius* positively asserts that St. James was invested by our Saviour with a Superiority over all the Apostles. 6. Wherefore was not that Decree issued forth in the Name of Peter, if he was the Monarch of the Church? 7. Why was St. Paul so immethodical to reckon on James before *Cephas* or Peter; and so arrogant as to say, that he was, in nothing, inferiour to the chiefeft Apostles (for if St. Peter was his Superior, he came short of him in something, which is very material, and that is Authority.) 8. Was not St. Paul a very unmannerly Vassal to rebuke his Lord and Master for Judaizing; and so solemnly, that both Jews and Gentiles were witness to the Reprofition? 9. How could St. Cyprian say that the rest of the Apostles were the fame that St. Peter was, *pari confortio prediti honoris & potestatis*? Finally, How could *Eusebius* aver (in his Old Editions, before they suffered the *Index Expurgatorius*) that Peter, James, and John were appointed Princes of the Apostles, and that these three were equal?

12. Since P. *Leo* the Tenth, with the consent and approbation of the *Lateran* Council (which they account General) declares that our Blessed Saviour did institute St. Peter (and his Successors in the Roman See) his Vicars, to whom, by the Testimony of the Book of Kings, it was so necessary to yield Obedience, that whosoever would not, was punished with Death: (thus *Binius Concil. Tom. 9.*) it may be pertinently demanded, if they have Five Books of the Kings, for in the Vulgar Version (which have four of that Name) there is not any Sylable which insinuates any such matter?

13. If the Bishop of *Rome* was invested *Jure Divino*, with an universal Jurisdiction over the Catholick Church; or if the *Roman* Church, either in its Head or Members, severally, or in all conjunctly, be endued with an infallible Spirit; how comes it to pass that all the antient Apologists were guilty of such a Supine Negligence (from *Justin Martyr*, the first of them, who lived, *Anno 150.* to *Theodoret* inclusive, who dyed about the middle of the Fifth Century) as never to mention

tion that most admirable Prerogative of the Roman Church above all the Societies in the World, since some of them descend to many minute Particulars, which are long ago obsolete and out of date in all the *Churches of Christ* ?

14. If it be a sufficient Answer for the Silence of the Apologists, to say, that they are so succinct, that they had no room for such a matter ? For though it is easily granted, that of *Asianus, Melito, Quadratus, and Aristides*, we have but Shreds in *Eusebius*; and that *Athenagoras, Tatian, Theophilus, Amiochenus, Minutius Felix, Cyprian ad Demetrianum, J. Firmicus Maternus*, are very brief; not to speak of many Orations written by the Fathers against *Julian the Apostate*, the Jews and Gentiles in general ( which are also reckoned among the Apologists, and are yet briefer ) yet the two Apologies of *Justin Martyr*, with his Dialogue with *Tryphon the Jew*, all the Works of *Clem. Alexandrinus*, save his *Padagogus*, the larger Apologetick of *Tertullian*, with his lesser *ad Scapulam*, and some Books against the Jews and Gentiles, the eight Books of *Origen* against *Celsus*, the seven Books of *Arnobius contra Gentes*, and so many of *Lactantius* his Institutions, *Eusebius de demonstratione & preparacione Evangelica*, *S. Augustin* his 22 Books *de Civitate Dei*, *Theodoret* his 12 Books *de curandis Gracorum affectibus*; all these are pretty Voluminous: yet *negrū quidem*, not the least word or insinuation of any such prodigious privilege of the Roman Church, either in its Head or Members.

15. What greater Elogy could have been given by any of the Fathers to *S. Peter*, than that which *S. Chrysostom* applies to *S. Paul*, that he was the Light of all the Churches, the Foundation of the Faith, the Pillar and Ground of Truth ?

16. Might not the Bishop of *Antioch* have claimed by virtue of Succession, a Superiority over all the Organical Members of the Catholick Church, as well as the Bishop of *Rome*; since it is certain, *S. Peter* resided seven years at *Antioch*; and it cannot be proved from any Authentick Record, that he was one year at *Rome* ?

17. May not the Bishop of *Hierusalem* ( which is the Mother of us all ) with better reason claim an universal Monarchy over the Church, by virtue of Succession; since the unquestionable Head of the Church dyed there ? And *S. James* the Lord's Brother, was unquestionably the first Bishop of the Christian World; whence *Epiphanius* concludes, that the Principality over the Church was due to him, and not to *S. Peter*.

18. Since its granted by *Bellarmin* and others, that *S. Peter's* Martyrdom at *Rome* was but accidental ( there being no Scripture Promise, or Catholick Tradition for it ) can the Bishop of *Rome*, by virtue

tue of his See, pretend to S. Peter's Spirit and Power, upon better grounds than *Vibius Rufus* did to the Genius of the Great *Cæsar*, because he bought his Chair ?

19. Could any of the Fathers have Complemented the Bishop of *Rome* with an higher Hyperbole, than *Synefius* the Bishop of *Cyrene*, did his Patriarch *Theophilus* of *Alexandria* (none of the best of men, for he was a great Persecutor of S. *Chrysostom*) by calling his Advice a Divine Response, and an Heavenly Oracle ?

20. Can any Instance be given of any Bishop of *Rome*, who before the famous Council of *Nice*, presumed to exercise any proper Act of Jurisdiction, without the proper Bounds of his own Patriarchat, called the Suburbicarian Churches, except P. *Victor* ; who for attempting to Censure others without his own Precinct, was severely reprehended by *Irenæus* ; and P. *Stephen*, who was justly censured by S. *Cyprian* ?

21. Since to be the ultimate Object of Appeals (or *dernier besoſt*, as the French phrase it) is the Essential Privilege of all Monarchs, is it accountable, that the Council of *Nice* believed the Bishop of *Rome's* Supremacy over the Catholick Church, when it determined, that all Appeals during the Intervals of general Councils, should be determined in the Provincial Synods, or by the respective Patriarchs ; and that there should be no Appeal from the one to the other ?

22. If the Churches of *Africa* believed the Popes Supremacy to be *jure divino*, how could 217 Bishops in the 6th. Council of *Carthage*, (whereof S. *Austin* was one) have opposed Three Popes successively in the matter of Appeals to *Rome* ; and condemned all those as Schismatics, who did thus Appeal ; and made a formal Separation of their Churches from the *Roman*, upon the account of its Illegal and Uncharitable Incroachments ?

23. If that Separation was unjust, how comes S. *Augustin* to be reputed over all the Christian World, and at *Rome* too, an eminent Saint ? since he died, (as the Romanists think) in actual and unrepented Schism : since S. *Augustin* denied the Popes Supremacy in matter of Appeals to *Rome*, no less than *Henry the Eighth of England*, might not P. *Cælestin* as justly have Excommunicated S. *Augustin*, as P. *Paul the Third*, did *Henry the Eighth of England* ?

24. Since by many of the Epistles of *Gregory the Great* to the Emperour *Mauricius*, and *John the Patriarch of Constantinople*, its apparent, that he declares all those Prelates who usurp the Titles of Oecumenical Patriarch, Universal Bishop, and Head of the Catholick Church, to be the Forerunners, or Harbangers of Antichrist ; may it not be pertinently demanded, if all those Popes who from *Boniface the Third* inclusively, have affected those Titles, do not stand condemned

denmed by the Judgment of their Predecessour as Antichristian?

25. If it be the Popes Prerogative ( as the Romanists pretend ) to assemble all the general Councils, how did it chance, that during a Thousand years after Christ, and more, there was not an Oecumenical Synod in *Italy*, no not in all the West, ( unless that of *Frankford* be accounted one, which was indicted by *Charlemain* against the Conventicle at *Nice* ) and that they were very desirous to have one in *Italy*, is most evident from the Letters of P. *Leo the First*, ( none of the meanest spirited Popes ) to *Theodosius the Younger*, his Sister *Psilchia*, the Emperour *Marcianus*, *Valentinian the Third*, with *Eudoxia* the Empress ; whom he did Supplicate on his Knees, with many Tears, ( thus he phraseth it ) for a Council to be holden in *Italy* against the *Eunychians* ; but could never obtain his desire, as to that Circumstance.

26. If the Emperours were nothing else but the Popes *Mandatarij* in the indicting of Councils ( as some term them ) what could be the reason that P. *Vigilius*, being personally in *Constantinople*, would not Countenance the 5<sup>th</sup> general Council, assembled there by *Justinian the Great*, till he was haled thereto by the Authority of the Emperour, and forced to obey the Mandat of his pretended *Mandatarius*, in condemning the *tria Capitula*, which by a former Constitution he had approved ?

27. If the Confirmation of a general Council by the Pope, be so necessary, that all its acts are invalid without it, ( as some Romanists pretend ) how could the Patriarchs of *Constantinople* be so irregular, as to possess the place in all succeeding Councils ( where they were present ) which the 2<sup>d</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> general Councils had allotted to them, notwithstanding of all the Protests of P. *Leo the First*, and his Successors, against those Council Acts ?

28. Since the Bishops of the Primitive Church were promiscuously termed Popes, ( from the old Greek word πάπας, which signifies a Father ) their Episcopal Sees, Thrones, and Empires ; and themselves, ( how small soever their Diocess were ) were also called Princes ( if we believe S. *Gregory Nazianzen*, and S. *Hilary of Poitiers* ) all were termed the Successors of the Apostles, and equal as to the intrinsic Power of Bishops, whether it were the little Bishoprick of *Eugubium*, compared with that of *Rome* ; *Rhegium* with that of *Constantinople* ; *Tanis* with *Alexandria* ; ( if we give Faith to S. *Hierom* ) therefore it may pertinently be demanded, What solid Grounds had *Hildebrand* to Monopolize those Titles to the Bishop of *Rome* ?

29. If the Romanists can produce any Authentick Author for the Decretal Epistles of all the Popes, from *Clemens* to P. *Sirvius*, ( that is

is to the middle, at the least, of the 4th Century) though they have made up a considerable part of the Canon Law, before *Riculfus* Archbishop of *Mentz*, who lived 500 years after those Popes were dead.

30. Since the Belief of an Infallible Headship in the Bishop of *Rome*, is with many Romanists, the reason why they receive their Articles of Faith; must it not then be the fundamental Article of all others? And ought it not to be the best attested by some plain places of Scripture; and not leave by its silence this sole visible Vicegerent of Christ, to the Suspicion of bearing witness to himself?

31. Since the Pope receives his Office with an Oath, to observe the Apostolick Canons (as they are termed) with the Canons of the Eight first general Councils; and notwithstanding, it is evident from the 35 and 36 Canons of the Apostles, (or the 33 and 34 Canons, as *Binius* hath them) that these are directly against the Popes Supremacy, as also the 5 and 7 Canons of the First general Council; the 9, 17, and 28 Canons of the Fourth general Council: the Fifth, in condemning the Sentence of *P. Vigilius*, (in favour of the *tria Capitula*) tho he was very vehement in the cause: the Sixth and Seventh, in Condemning *P. Honorius* of Heresie: the Eighth and last, by imposing a Canon upon the Church of *Rome*, and challenging Obedience thereunto, (viz. its Condemning a Custom of the Sabbath Fast in Lent) may we not very rationally hence conclude, that the Fathers during eight hundred and seventy years after Christ, knew no such thing as the Popes Supremacy by Divine Right, or any Right at all, seeing they opposed it: And that they did not believe the Infallibility of the Church of *Rome*, that they had no Tradition of either that Supremacy or Infallibility, that it is in vain to plead Antiquity in the Fathers, or Councils, or Primitive Church, for either: and that the Canons of these eight general Councils, being the sense both of the ancient and the professed Faith of the present Church of *Rome*, the Popes Authority must needs stand Condemned by the Catholick Church at this day, by the ancient Church, and the present Church of *Rome* her self, as she holds Communion (at least in Profession) with the ancient? And in fine, how can the Church of *Rome* escape the charge of Heresie? for he who believes the Popes Supremacy, denies in effect, the eight first general Councils, (at least in that point) and that's Heresie; and he who believes the Council of *Trent*, believes the Article of the Popes Supremacy; therefore he who believes the Council of *Trent*, doth not believe the eight first general Councils, and therefore is guilty of Heresie: And how can any Pope evade the Brand of Schism, (the foulest that ever the Church groaned under) aggravated with the horrid Crime of Perjury; since the Pope (as such)

such) professeth to believe, and sweareth to govern the Church according to the Canons of the first General Councils, yet openly claims, and professedly practiseth a Power condemned by them all: thus, *quaenam* Pope, he stands guilty of Separation from the ancient Church; and as Head of a new and strange Society, draws the Body of his Faction after him into the same Schism, in flat contradiction to the ancient Church, and to that solemn Oath by which also the Pope, as Pope, binds himself (at his Inauguration) to maintain the Doctrine and Practice thereof.

---

## S E C T. XXI.

### *Of the Pope's Depositing Power.*

*Qu. 1.* Since the Fourth *Lateran* Council, under *Innocent the Third*, promised a Plenary Pardon of all their Sins, and a greater Degree of Glory hereafter, to those who did extirpate Hereticks; if it may not be presumed that this most bountiful Proffer doth animate Traitors to murther their own Princes, whom *Rome* hath declared Heretical?

2. What greater reason is there of expounding these words spoken to *Jeremy*, (*I have set thee over Kings to root out, to pluck up, and destroy*) of the Pope's Supremacy, and Depositing Power, (as both *Innocent the Third*, and the Canon-Law do) than had the *Donatists* of applying those words in the *Canticles*, (*Tell me, O thou whom my Soul loveth, where thou feedest, where thou makest thy Flock to rest at Noon*) to the Flock of their Party in the Southern Country of *Africa*?

3. If any be so quick-sighted as to find the Popes Universal Monarchy and Depositing Power in these Words, *Feed my Sheep* (Heretical Princes being those Wolves which are to be driven away as hurtful to the Flock) may not such a *Lyncean* Eye by a like kind of Interpretation find this other Mystery in the Words, that all Christians are Fools, because Sheep are silly Creatures?

4. Since the Doctrine of Depositing Power in Popes (by which I mean not only their excommunicating absolute Monarchs, but also the exposing their Dominions as a just Prey to the first Invader) is so scandalous to the Christian Religion in the Eyes of all sober Romanists, and hath been found so mischievous to many Sovereign Princes; wherefore was not that destructive Doctrine condemned by some General Council, they having had many which they account such, since the Fourth Council of *Lateran*, under *Innocent the Third*, where

It was certainly defined, let them call it an Article of Faith, a Point of Discipline, or what they will.

5. Since it is evident from *Baronius, Birius, Platina, Onuphrius*, and many others, that *Gregory the 7th.* (nick-named *Hildebrand*) did excommunicate *Henry the 4th.* Emperor of *Germany* : *P. Paschal the 2d, Henry the 5th, Alexander the 3d, Frederick the 1st, Innocent the 4th, Frederick the 2d, Boniface the 8th, Philip the Fair of France* : *Julius the 2d, Lewis the 12th.* with him who was King of *Navarre* at that time ; (on which putrid Title *Ferdinand the Catholick* seized on his Kingdom) and that *Alexander the 3d* did also excommunicate *Henry the 2d. of England* : And *Innocent the 3d, King John*, (Six years before the Resignation of his Crown into the Hands of that Popes Legat;) may it not be justly doubted, if they who can confidently aver that never any Pope presumed to excommunicate an absolute Prince, did ever read those Histories, if so be they have put in Print what they did think ?

6. Whether that place, *1 Pet. 2. 13.* which is quoted by *P. Innocent the 3d.* in his arrogant Epistle to the Emperor of *Constantinople*, doth prove that the Pope is as much greater than the Emperor, as the Sun is greater than the Moon ? which strange Comparifon is inserted by *Gregory the 9th.* into the Body of the Canon-Law ; and ever since continued in all the Editions of that Law.

7. If *Gregory the Great* imagined himself superiour to the Emperor *Mauritius*, and not rather much his Inferiour, when he wrote to that Emperor, that in Obedience to his Commands he had published one of his Laws, which himself judged scarce agreeable to the Law of God ?

8. If (according to the Doctrine of the Church of *Rome*) it can properly be called Rebellion to resist and dethrone a deposed Prince, or if it can be termed true Loyalty to defend him ? Since the deposing Doctrine doth import, that when a Prince is deposed by the Authority of their Church, they absolve their Subjects from their Fealty ; and then it is no Rebellion to take up Arms.

9. Since the deposing Doctrine hath been decreed and practised by their Popes and General Councils, and that no Pope or Council since *Gregory the 7th.* hath ever condemned it ; and that the Jesuits do still maintain it, (their greatest Champions, *Bellarmin, Suarez, Bocan, Gretzer, Mariana, Sanctarellus*, and many others, having expressly declared for it) yea, tho the present Pope (who is not the worst of the Pack) did lately censure some other Jesuitical Doctrines (as great Immoralities) yet he thought fit to let the deposing Doctrine escape without Censure ; may we not justly admire how some of this Age have the Effrontory to out-face all Mankind (who have Eyes in their Heads,

Heads; and Skill enough to read the Decrees of their Popes and Councils) by saying that the deposing Doctrine is not the Doctrine of the Church of *Rome*, but of a nameless Party ?

10. As for those who Found their Loyalty upon this Supposition, that the deposing Doctrine is not the Doctrine of the Roman Church, doth not this Hypothesis afford a shrewd Suspicion, that if it were the Doctrine of the Church of *Rome*, or ever should be so, or they should ever be convinced that it is so, then they would be for the deposing of Princes, no less than those, who at this Day believe it to be the Doctrine thereof ?

11. May it not be justly doubted, whatever some little inferior People in Communion with the Church of *Rome* think of these Matters, while the Governing part of the Church believes otherwife, as they certainly do, at this day (if the Pope and his Adherents are the Governing Part) Princes have no security that Popes will not challenge and exercise this Authority, but their want of Power to do it, which is wholly owing to the Reformation ; for till Princes had Subjects who valued not the Popes Authority, they themselves were the Popes Vassals, and must necessarily be so again, could they extinguish this pestilent Northern Heresie (as they phrase it) the great Fault of which is, that it hath given Strength and Security to Princes, by weakening the Popes Pretensions.

12. Since the Council of *Constance* owns the 4th. Council of *Lateran* for a General Council, *Seß. 39.* (where the deposing Power is as expressly declared as any thing can be, unless Men will quibble upon Words, and make Nonsense of them) and that P. *Martin* the 5th. in his Bull for the Confirmation of the Council of *Constance*, *Seß. 43.* gives the Sense of the Proposition of that Council, *Seß. 15.* may it not be very pertinently asserted, that the said Council condemns only the killing of a Tyrant, and not of an Heretick ; and the killing of a Tyrant, who is not condemned and depos'd, not of one who is excommunicated for Heresie ; for that last Clause, without expecting the Sentence and Command of a Judge, supposes that it may be a very lawful and meritorious Act to kill such Princes as are depos'd by Superior Judges, that is, by the Pope or Council ; which is the only Authority that ever pretended to judge or depose Sovereign Princes ; and therefore when *Suarez* was urged with this Decree, he answered, *Defens. Fidei. lib. 6. cap. 4. Where do you find in the Acts of that Council, that this extends to Princes excommunicated or depos'd by the Pope?*

13. If we may take and leave of the Roman Councils what we please, and be good Catholicks still ; wherefore may we not reject the Decrees of their Councils about Transubstantiation, Purgatory,

Indulgences, the Invocation of Saints, and Worship of Images, &c. and continue as good Catholicks as they are, who renounce the Authority of their Councils as to the deposing Power ?

14. Since P. *Paul the 5th.* (Anno 1606.) by a Breve written to the English Catholicks, declared and taught them, as Pastor of their Souls, that the Oath of Allegiance, established by Parliament, (3 Jac. 1.) cannot be taken without violating the Christian Faith, and injuring the Salvation of their Souls, as containing many things which are manifestly contrary to Faith and Salvation : Now, (as the Author of the First Treatise against the Oath of Allegiance, called, *The Jesuits Loyalty*, well observes) there are not in it (*multa*) many things to which this Censure is possibly applicable, unless this be one, that the Pope hath no Power to depose the King, or absolve his Subjects from the Oath of Allegiance ; now when in Obedience to the Pope, the Roman Catholicks have to this day obstinately refused this Oath (some very few excepted, who were Anathematized at *Rome* for doing so) is there not reason to suspect, that they are not clear in this Point ? and that they who will not abjure so pernicious a Doctrine, may be perswaded to practise it when time serves, and then let any man judge what security there is of their Loyalty ?

15. As for those Loyal English Romanists, who will not allow the Deposing Doctrine to be the Doctrine of the Church of *Rome*, though they acknowledge it to have been Decreed by Popes and Councils, because all the Ages before *Gregory the Seventh*, were positively against the Deposing Doctrine, that this was a Doctrine brought in in the 11th Century, against the Judgment and Practice of Ten before, and that all the Fathers were against it ; must they not needs go upon these Principles, 1. That Popes and Councils may, and have decreed such Doctrines as are contrary to Scripture and Catholick Tradition ? 2. That no good Catholick is bound to own such Doctrines, though decreed by Popes and Councils ? 3. That this Doctrine (although so decreed) is not the Doctrine of the Catholick Church ? 4. That men are good Catholicks, not by adhering to the Doctrine of Popes and Councils, but to the Scriptures, expounded by Primitive and Catholick Tradition ? These are indeed the better Subjects, for adhering to those Principles ; for those are the very Principles on which our Reformation is founded, and by which we justifie our selves against the Innovations of the Church of *Rome* : But though these Principles will justifie the Reformation, yet they will not prove, that this Deposing Doctrine is not taught by the present Church of *Rome*.

16. But to shut up all these Queries concerning that vile Deposing Doctrine, I desire only to be informed, what Roman Catholick Nation,

tion, who had all the Power in their hands, would have suffered a Protestant Prince to Succeed quietly to his Throne? We know how it fared with *Henry the Fourth of France*, (notwithstanding the Parliament of *Paris*, burnt *Mariana's Book*) and what *Henrician Hereticks* in those days signified; but our Church teaches better; and the True Sons of the Church practise better; and we hope they shall never have reason to repent of what they have done.

## S E C T. XXII.

### *Of their Uncharitableness to all other Christians.*

*Qu.* 1. **H**ow can they be vindicated from Hypocrisie in a very high degree (beside their Uncharitableness) who after they have Condemned an Heretick, and delivered him to the Secular Judge to be burnt, yet thus bespeak him; *We passionately desire you for the Love of God, and in regard of Piety, Mercy, and our Mediation, you would free this miserable person from all danger of Death, or maulation of Members*; How can this be reconciled to the 20 Cap. of the 25 Sess. of the Council of *Trent* about Reformation?

2. Since *Boniface* the Eighth hath determined, that it is indispensably necessary for all men, to believe the Bishop of *Rome* to be the Occumenical Patriarch, the Universal Bishop, the Visible Head and Monarch of the Catholick Church, the Infallible Doctor of its Faith and Manners, *S. Peters Successor*, and Christ's Sole Vicar upon Earth, (which Arrogant Titles are now become a part of their Canon Law, and occur frequently in the sixth Book of the *Decretalia*) may it not be pertinently demanded, Where was their Charity to all Christians before the time of *Boniface* the Third, (who dyed in the 7th Century) seeing there is no Bishop of *Rome* found, who did assume, or claim those insolent Epithets before that time?

3. What difference can be assigned betwixt the old Donatists and the present Romanists? since the former confined the True Church of Christ to *Africa*, (yea, to that Corner of it, which was *ex parte Donati*) and the later to *Rome*?

4. Let us suppose a man to walk as Conformably to the Precepts of the Gospel, as ever any of the Sons of *Adam* (Christ only excepted) would it not argue the height of uncharitableness, to Damn that man in our Imaginations, because he cannot believe the Popes Supremacy to be *jure divino*, for want of Divine Revelation; since the best Logician in the World cannot deduce it from any place of Scripture, *per decimam sextam Consequentiam*? 5. Be-

5. Because some moderate Protestants grant, that he who is under Invincible Ignorance of the Corruptions of the Roman Church, and makes Conscience to live up to his Light, may through the infinite Mercy of God be saved, (though he live and die in that Society;) hence to argue, that its best to joyn in Communion with the Church of *Rome*, wherein (by consent of both parties) Salvation may be had; doth the force of that Argument, in the eyes of sober persons, amount to any more than this, Come over to us, for we have less Charity than ye? whereas a good Christian (who understands the nature of his Holy Religion) will be ready to answer, I will rather stay in that Church which enjoys most of that supernatural Quality, which is Essential to Christianity.

6. Because a man thinks that his Neighbour (who is of a strong natural Constitution, highly courageous, and very temperate) may be preserved from Death in a Pelethouse; doth it hence follow, that he believes his Neighbour is in as safe a condition, as he who lives at a great distance from any danger of Contagion?

7. If it be a solid Argument to comply with that Tenet, wherein both parties are agreed, wherefore doth not the Church of *Rome* embrace the Protestant Doctrine of Christ's Presence in the Eucharist? for all sober Christians in the World acknowledge that he is really present, tho in a Spiritual and Mystical manner: To this the Romanists have superadded their mode of Transubstantiation, and the *Lutherans* their Consubstantiation; therefore its safest to Acquiesce in that wherein all Dissenting parties are agreed: the same may be urged as to many other particulars, even all their Superadditions to the ancient Creeds.

8. It may be further demanded, if there be any Solidity in this Topick, have not the *Cerinthians*, the *Sarcofatenians*, the *Arians*, *Eunomians*, *Photinians*, and *Socinians*, the better of the Orthodox by that way of arguing, since its acknowledged *hinc inde*, by all, that Christ was truly a man, made like to us in all things, *Sin only excepted?* but the fallacy of this Topick is so evident, that it is lost labour to insist any more upon it.

9. Can it consist with Charity, to call those Schismaticks, who are not *fugitiivi sed fugari*; and to Anathematize them every year (on *Manday Thursday*) as Hereticks, who believe the whole Scriptures of God in the sense of the Primitive Church; and who embrace all the Creeds of the four general Councils that were first in order?

10. Did not the leading party in the Council of *Trent*, discover themselves to be Physicians of no value, and Men of no Charity, by using their utmost endeavours to perpetuate that deplorable ~~Breach~~ in the Visible Church? which I account better express'd in the words

words of the History thereof, which are as followeth. *This Council, desired and procured by Godly Men to re-unite the Church, which began to be divided, hath so established the Schism, and made the Parties so Obstinate, that the Discords are irreconcilable: and being managed by Princes for Reformation of Ecclesiastical Discipline, hath caused the greatest deformation that ever was since Christianity did begin; and hoped for by the Bishops themselves, to regain the Episcopal Authority, ( for the most part usurped by the Pope) hath made them lose it altogether, bringing them into much greater Servitude: on the contrary, feared and avoided by the See of Rome (as a potent means to moderate the Exorbitant Power thereof) mounted from small beginnings, by divers degrees, to an unlimited Excess, it hath so established and confirmed the same over that part which remained subject to it, &c.*

11. Since its evident from unquestionable Records, that the Church of *Rome* ( I mean all of that persuasion ) amounts not to the third part of Christendom ( if all the Protestants, of whatsoever denomination, the Greek Church properly so called, with all those Christians in *Asia* and *Africa*, which are neither of the Roman nor Greek Communion, be reckoned upon ) it may be demanded, with what Charity the Romanists monopolize to themselves the Title of the Catholick Church ?

---

F I N I S.

---

Some Books lately Printed for Brab. Aylmer.

**A** Treatise of the Pope's Supremacy: to which is added, A Discourse concerning the Unity of the Church. By Dr. Isaac Barrow.

A Discourse against Transubstantiation. By Dr. Tillotson.

A Discourse concerning the Adoration of the Host, as it is Taught and Practised in the Church of Rome.

A Discourse of the Communion in One Kind: In Answer to a Treatise of the Bishop of Meaux's.

A Discourse against Purgatory.

FINIS

57522

REPRODUCED FROM THE COPY IN THE

**HENRY E. HUNTINGTON LIBRARY**

---

FOR REFERENCE ONLY. NOT FOR REPRODUCTION